

5-2003

Questioning the Superstructure: A Marxist Critique of the Rainbow and Women in Love

Diantha Acevedo
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Fiction Commons](#), [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#), and the [Political Theory Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Acevedo, Diantha, "Questioning the Superstructure: A Marxist Critique of the Rainbow and Women in Love" (2003). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 2480.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2480>

**Questioning the Superstructure: A Marxist Critique of *The Rainbow*
and *Women in Love***

Diantha Acevedo

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts in the Department of English**

**Seton Hall University
May 2003**

Approved by

Marbles Carpenter
Mentor

James R. Lindroth
Second Reader

Abstract

Written nearly a century ago, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* by D.H. Lawrence continue to captivate readers with their critiques of love, individualism, and capitalism. Throughout the past few decades, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* have prompted varying interpretations through the vantage point of several critical approaches. By recognizing the reflections of several schools of criticism while exploring Lawrence's political consciousness in the novels, it is the intention of this essay to explore the previous critical approaches as the foundation for supporting the emergence of a twenty-first century Marxist critique. The essay delves into the critical interpretations of the novels from 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and the present. Through exploring the critical interpretations of D.H. Lawrence's *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* by Kinkead Weekes, Keith Sagar, John Worthen as well as several other scholars, it is apparent that a true Marxist critique of the novels must emerge. Terry Eagleton, Marxist critic, has published many literary works focusing on the role of Marxism within literature. Through gaining an understanding of Eagleton's contribution to the Western view of Marxist criticism, the arguments suggested by this essay regarding Lawrence's novels will aid in explaining the overwhelming Marxist components to D.H. Lawrence's novels.

Questioning the Superstructure:

A Marxist Critique of *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*

Diantha Acevedo
Thesis
Dr. Carpentier
May 8, 2003

Written nearly a century ago, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* by D.H. Lawrence continue to captivate readers with their critiques of love, individualism, and capitalism. Both novels were originally intended in 1913 to be bound into one novel, *The Sisters*. The following year, the *Wedding Ring* replaced the working title, *The Sisters*, and two separate novels emerged. Due to the untraditional content, *The Rainbow*, published in 1915, and *Women in Love*, in print five years later, were initially denied publication. Since Lawrence first released these novels into circulation, the critical interpretations of his work have varied. On October 6, 1915, Robert Lynd from the Daily News in Europe called *The Rainbow* “ ‘a monotonous wilderness of phallicism’ and its characters ‘as lacking in the inhibitions of ordinary civilized life as savages’ ” (Weekes 275) while American reviewers “ ‘saw the new novel as a work of tragic power’ ” (Weekes 657). *Women in Love* received equally negative reviews; *The Observer* complained that “ ‘page after page reads like the ravings of some unfortunate being subjected to the third degree’ while the *New Statesman*’s critic, Rebecca West, wrote “ ‘many of us are cleverer than Mr. D.H. Lawrence and nearly all of us, save an incarcerated few, are much saner’ ” (Worthen 89). Throughout the past few decades, *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* have prompted varying interpretations through the vantage point of several critical approaches. By recognizing the reflections of several schools of criticism while exploring Lawrence’s political consciousness in the novels, it is the intention of this essay to explore the previous critical approaches as the foundation for supporting the emergence of a twenty-first century Marxist critique.

Within each decade, scholars become engaged by new critical approaches to literature. During the 1970’s, scholarly writings focused on the role of characters within

the novels, specifically Lawrence's treatment of women in *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, while the 1980's revealed a trend toward the exploration of Lawrence's writing style. Critics such as John Worthen and Keith Sagar focused on the composition, style, and language of Lawrence's novels. In 1979, John Worthen published *D.H. Lawrence and the Idea of the Novel*, which explored several of Lawrence's novels in depth. Within his discussion of *The Rainbow*, Worthen cites this novel as "one of the great, complicated novels of language; the experiences with which Lawrence is concerned need a special language, and accordingly he invents it" (61). Sagar as well published a critical piece in 1985, *D.H. Lawrence: Life Into Art*, that explores Lawrence's writing style through focusing on Lawrence's life. In analyzing *Women in Love*, Sagar asserts, "the complexity of characterization is matched by a complexity of structure, symbolism, and language" (149). Sagar's assertion is validated by Lawrence's conversation with his agent, Pinker, in which Lawrence proclaims, " 'all rules of construction hold good only for novels which are copies of other novels' " (Sagar 149). *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* are unlike other novels of the period and as a result cannot rely on similar structures. Although the 1980s produced varying critiques, the prevalent focus remained on structural components.

Within the 90's, psychoanalytic, gender, cultural, and new historicism critiques became the influential critical approaches. Kinkead Weekes and Peter Balbert along with numerous Lawrencian critics published literary critiques applying the four critical approaches mentioned. The critics of this decade focused on the Oedipus complex between father and child in *The Rainbow*, opposite and same sex relations in *Women in Love*, as well as Gerald Crich's role within the social machine. Weekes' essay, "The

sense of History in 'The Rainbow,' " explores the relationship between the characters while focusing on gender; "as archetypal Men and Women give way to Tom and Lydia, the personal stories reveal both impulses conflicting in each, and both individuals unfulfilled" (Preston and Hoare131). Suspending the scrutinization of character relations to allow focus on more global issues, Balbert in *D.H. Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination* divulges that "*The Rainbow* is a testament to the conservative impulse in Lawrence that is at the heart of his most apocalyptic doctrines; it reflects a sensibility inclined towards traditional forms of worship, stability, and passion even though he wishes to transmute and invigorate the forms" (59-60). Although scholars in the 1990's produced extensive critiques of the novels, the critics of the current era have ceased to critically explore *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*.

Studies of the novels within the past few years have decreased. The majority of criticism written during the present decade consists of exploring the novels to produce teaching methods of D.H Lawrence's literature. However the critiques anthologized by editor Paul Poplawski in *Writing the Body in D. H. Lawrence*, do not delve into the novels for purposes of producing an academic tool, but rather attempt to obtain "new ways of writing about the body and bodily experience. With one or two notable exceptions, however, few critics have systematically interrogated the broader ramifications of this concern, particularly as they feed into contemporary theoretical debates about language, representation, sexuality, and the body" (VIII). Andrew Harrison, Izabel F.O. Brandao, and Kyoko Kay Kondo's essays draw variously on French feminism, Jungian psychoanalysis, and stylistic approaches. The Marxist critique being presently presented emerges from the shadows of the recent critical approaches like those

mentioned previously. The recent predominance of cultural and psychoanalytic approaches, such as reviewed in Richard Hoggart's *Between Two Worlds*, have magnified the need for a Marxist critique of *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. Hoggart asserts that "informed critical opinion on Lawrence depends not so much on his attitudes towards sex as on his achievement as a novelist of individual and social perceptions, on his psychological and social analysis, and on his insights into intricate human relations above all" (59). Hoggart's perception of Lawrence's work could be seen as slightly Marxist, yet, it does not venture far enough. Shifting away from the traditional focus on relationships in connection with Lawrence's construction of the self and gender relations, *Between Two Worlds* focuses on the characters in relation to social constructions. Although Lawrence was not a Marxist, his political critique of Victorian capitalism's dehumanization of the worker, displacement of the artist, and socially constructed marriages coincides with Marxist ideals. Within *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, Lawrence presents a Marxist analysis of the power structures with a Modernist's solution that emphasizes individualism and the spirit. This essay will combine the reflections of other schools of criticism while exploring Lawrence's overwhelming political consciousness in the novels through a Marxist critique.

Terry Eagleton, Marxist critic, has published many literary works focusing on the role of Marxism within literature. Through gaining an understanding of Eagleton's contribution to the Western view of Marxist criticism, the arguments suggested by this essay regarding Lawrence's novels will explain "more fully; and this means a sensitive attention to its forms, styles and meanings. But it also means grasping those forms, styles and meanings as the products of a particular history" (Eagleton 3). While I examine the

economic base and “superstructure” consisting of laws, politics, philosophy, religion, and art in the two novels, the functions of power of the social class is obviously questioned by Lawrence. Although the focus in Marxist critique relies heavily upon economic production, the superstructure consists of precise forms of social consciousness beyond the productive forces. Frederick Engels, one of Marx’s contemporaries, in a letter to Joseph Bloch in 1890, asserts “ ‘the economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure-political forms of the class struggle and its consequences...philosophical theories, religious ideas and their further development into systems of dogma-also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form’ ” (Eagleton 9). In essence, the ideology of an established society has the ability to dictate all aspects of life. (Eagleton 5). Throughout both *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*, Lawrence seeks to question the hegemony as well as exploring the concept of reification. The characters in both novels seem to be in constant battle with the social machine. Lawrence has achieved what Marxist critic George Lukacs would call “a radically different mode of characterization: socialism forms a different kind of individual, and will demand a different form of art to realize it” (Eagleton 72). *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* embody a different form of art desired by the Marxists.

The Rainbow reveals the ideological oppression of the dominant economic class over subordinate classes through the critical dissection of the Bragwen family. As the novel opens, Lawrence introduces the Marsh farm, the Bragwen estate, and its inhabitants in great detail. Although the Bragwens own industrious property, they have not become wealthy due to the continual growth of the family. Working their own land, the Bragwens

“went without fear of necessity, working hard because of the life that was in them, not for want of the money” (TR 9). The generations of Bragwen males have been free from the reification process. They do not work their land for an outside beneficiary nor have they become commodities of the social machine. However, the men’s complacency in farm life does not extend itself to the Bragwen women. Not being enticed by the pastoral wonderland, “the women were different...they were aware of the lips and the mind of the world speaking and giving utterance, they heard the sound in the distance, and they strained to listen” (TR 10). The sound echoing from the distance call the female Bragwens to desire to be included in the superstructure rather than rely on the fulfillment gained from low base, which is attached to the life of a farmer. Eventually, the physical effects of industrialization invade the Marsh farm and tempt the women to desire more than the endless pastures. Their gaze ventures beyond life at the farm into the horizon at obtaining a different form of civilization.

During 1840, Alfred Bragwen, his wife, four sons, and two daughters occupy the Marsh farm and sell pieces of their land to promote industrialization as well as financially benefit. A canal, colliery, and railroad soon freely trespass across the Marsh farm. The outward expansion of the neighboring town, keep the Bragwens busy; “producing supplies, they became richer, they were almost tradesmen” yet the farm still remained somewhat secluded (TR 13). As the production of goods increase and the building of new industries flourish, the Bragwen children begin to grow older and venture towards their own destinies. Tom, the youngest son, departs to school and only returns home after the death of his father at seventeen years of age. Being the youngest child, Tom feels a responsibility to devote himself to the farm. As a result, the novel revolves around

Tom's courtship of his wife, his relationship with his stepdaughter Anna, Anna's marriage, and her children.

Barely twenty years old, Tom begins to question his understanding of women. In his mind, "the woman was the symbol for that further life which comprised religion and love and morality" (TR 20). Only after his sexual encounter with a prostitute at nineteen does Tom realize that there is not "only one kind of woman" (TR 20). He becomes horrified by the shattered image of the female gender. The prostitute embodies the commodification of woman. Her worth is valued by her vocation and in essence she becomes viewed as nothing more than her sexual trade. Tom has not yet been exposed to the downfalls of the social machine, rather only the financial gain received by his family. Yet, Tom does not become discouraged by this new revelation, rather his "desire to find in a woman the embodiment of all his inarticulate, powerful religious impulses" grew (TR 21). Through this experience, he begins to work within the superstructure, and rather than become tainted by his disillusion of one type of woman, he is embracing the era's ideology. The prostitute can be seen as an extension of her trade rather than a negative reflection on society's perceived ideals of the female nature. Tom has successfully commodified the prostitute and isolated his future wife in the realm of the accepted ideology.

As Tom becomes enticed by the mysterious nature of the Polish lady, Lydia Lensky, he begins to function slightly outside the ideology. Since the term ideology refers to an unquestionable shared belief and value system in a given culture, the ideology shared by Tom's society would unlikely deem his courtship of the Polish housekeeper with a bastard child unacceptable. However, she is not a prostitute and he

can see beyond her humble vocation due to the similarities between a wife and housekeeper. He seems to reason that a housekeeper and wife both care for the home and its inhabitants. Witnessing her caring for another's home and her child, he becomes entranced by the domesticity of it all. As a result, he attempts to force brief encounters that are to appear unplanned.

After this courting process, Tom ventures to her abode with intentions of asking her to marry him and yet "he was watching her, without knowing her, only aware underneath of her presence" (TR 43). Throughout the courtship, Tom never becomes knowledgeable about the nature of the woman who occupies his every thought. She is Polish, a housekeeper, and mother-that is all he comprehends. Although he asks her to be his wife, "they were strangers, they must forever be such strangers" (TR 48). The marriage is formulated through Tom's desire to become a member of the social machine. His marriage reflects the social view of a wife and housekeeper as functioning throughout life with similar positions. Through marriage, Lydia will become Tom's housekeeper and remain a commodified individual.

As the novel adroitly passes through their life together, the pages include only their spiritual separation and the bond formed between Tom and Lydia's daughter Anna. Through their ill match, Tom begins to question, "did he own her? Was she here forever? He did not feel like a master, husband, father of her children" (TR 58). Although he does not feel like her "master," he wanted to own her and to be everything that he expressed that he wasn't. Tom's hegemony prompts him to believe that a woman can be owned. However, the love and adoration from Anna satisfies his need to be the master since "they were like lovers, father and child" (TR 62). Their relationship as well as Anna's

development as a strong character dominates the beginning of the novel. The first few pages are devoted to the union between Tom and Lydia whereas the following chapters reveal the strength of Anna.

Lawrence's depiction of Anna as an individual spirit is separated into three parts and chapters. There is first "The Childhood of Anna Lensky," detailing the early family life, "The Girlhood of Anna Bragwen," exploring her teenage years away at school, and "Wedding at the March," delving into the married life of Anna. In the first chapter devoted to Anna, Lawrence exposes her need for Tom. She "then loved Bragwen most. For the two made a little life together, they had a joint activity. It amused him, at evening, to teach her to count, or to say her letters" (TR 79) and deemed children her age beneath her, "she domineered them, she treated them as if they were extremely young and incapable, to her they were little people, they were not her equals" (TR 80). Anna's outlook on the children places them in a subordinate class while she joins her father in the dominant class. Her perceptions rely on the education process; the children are deemed a lower status due to their inferior intellect. Although Anna shares the same years on earth as these children, her close relationship with her father and adult-like knowledge places her above her peers.

As Anna grows older, Lawrence adds a new chapter to *The Rainbow*, "The Girlhood of Anna Bragwen." At age nine, she is sent off to a school in Cossethay where her feelings of superiority prevail. As a child, "she had a curious contempt for ordinary people, a benevolent superiority. She deeply hated ugliness or intrusion or arrogance" (TR 92). Lawrence creates a child that had already been warped by the sensibilities of society. Her superior attitude and negative reflections on various groups of people would

seem odd for a child of nine. During childhood, one believes the restrictions of the ideology are not applicable; it is a period in one's life where social critique is void; children do not obsess about the social norms; rather they are free from the restrictions and conduct themselves as individual spirits. However, Lawrence allows the corruption of this child to personify the dangers of becoming a member of the traditional society. Anna has no friends due to her inability to accept those that she deems "ordinary," "She was too much the center of her own universe, too little aware of anything outside" (TR 92).

Throughout the chapter, Lydia's distaste for Anna is discussed, Anna's growing affection for Tom, and most importantly the arrival of cousin Will Bragwen. At this point, Anna is eighteen and barely acknowledges her cousin's arrival. Like her father during his late teens, Anna begins to question the value of the opposite sex. Although she has come into contact with many young men, "they were objects of amusement and faint wonder to her, rather than real beings, the young men" (TR 100). Her perception of males is reflective upon her father; "he embraced all manhood for her, and other men were just incidental" (TR 100). Tom's commodification of his female counterpart is reflected in Anna's dehumanization of her male suitors. They are meaningless and insignificant because, like her father, she has one type of male in mind, him. However as the relationship between Anna and Will develops, "the two young people drew apart, escaped from the elders, to create a new thing by themselves" (TR 107). Through the barely articulate influence of Will, Anna becomes independent of her parents and no longer relies on the image her male ideal nor the superstructure.

As the courtship continues, Will utilizes his chosen vocation as a wood-carver to create a butter stamper for Anna. The present creates a picture of both domesticity sustained by the ideology and individual freedom alike. Since Will carves wood, he does not seem to rely on the constraints of the social machine. Using raw material that is obtained from the earth, he freely exercises his individuality through his vocation. He would not appear to function within the sphere of the superstructure and as a result cannot be constrained by the cultural ideals. Will does not produce mass quantities to fulfill the demands of society rather his work is personal. Through his choice of creation, Will has also added a level of imposed female domesticity. However, Anna's reaction and usage of the butter stamper allow the two to create their own form of existence. Being in the form of a mythological bird, the stamp acts as a symbol of the traditional ideology being subverted by an individualistic freedom; "she loved creating it over and over again. And every time she looked, it seemed a new thing come to life. Every piece of butter became this strange, vital emblem" (TR 109). This small token of affection eventually leads up to Will asking Anna to become his wife despite Tom's disagreeable emotions.

As one would expect "Wedding at the Marsh," displays the wedding ceremony as well as the consummation of the marriage. The union between Anna and William Bragwen resembles a typical wedding procession. However, it is Lawrence's depiction of the honeymoon night that is odd to a contemporary reader. After the two have retired to their bedroom, Tom and his brothers serenade his daughter and now husband outside their window on their wedding night. The characters' need to control even the love making of the newlyweds is a product of the superstructure. By singing and playing

instruments to a particular beat, they are dictating the sexual rhythm that Will and Anna's bodies will form. Rather than allowing the spiritual and religious consummation to proceed, they must control the sexual rhythm.

Within the opening of "Anna Victrix," the newly united couple spends their honeymoon secluded in their cottage. Although in courtship Will finds freedom through Anna's wild spirit, he begins to recognize her behavior as taunting his conventional mind upon marriage. Will is troubled by the indecency of lying in bed all day and not getting "up in the morning and wash oneself and be a decent social being" (TR139). She strips him naked in the daylight and proceeds to fall in and out of sleep throughout the majority of the days in the cottage. They began to disagree about many things such as religion. Upon sketching images of Adam and Eve, Anna becomes enraged by Will's unwillingness to accept her picture of oversized Eve and small portrayal of Adam. Will mockingly comments on Anna's unrealistic portrayal of Adam and Eve while she simply responds, " 'it is impudence to say that Woman was made out of Man's body,' she continued, " 'when every man is born of woman. What impudence men have, what arrogance!' "(TR 162). Her outlook on religion is twisted to satisfy her own belief system.

Rather than choosing to focus on the biblical story of Adam and Eve that through Adam's rib Eve came into creation, Anna chooses to focus on the "worship of the human knowledge" (TR 161). Since the female perpetuates human life, Anna desires to view Eve as the holder of power. By reflecting upon the biblical story of Adam and Eve's fall from the Garden of Eden, Anna would seem correct in viewing Eve as the stronger of the two. However, that also places the female at both a level of strength and weakness. Eve

became weakened by Satan and in return deceived Adam. Working within this structure, Eve becomes Anna while Satan is replaced by the superstructure and Adam with Will. The overpowering superstructure attempts to pollute and poison, as did Satan, therefore Anna can then manipulate Will since he is merely a decedent of Adam.

As Will and Anna attempt to coexist amongst preset opposing belief systems, Anna becomes aware that she is with child. During her pregnancy, Anna is thrilled to be expecting her first offspring. She yearns for youthful things, which is not necessarily children. However, this child could rejuvenate Anna and Will to the loving teenagers they once were a year prior. While in bed one evening, Anna notices, "there was a strange, dark tension about her husband" (TR168). He begins to sexually force himself upon her while she screams out in opposition. Questioning why, she begins to think about how "she wanted so much the joy and the vagueness and the innocence of her pregnancy. She did not want his bitter-corrosive love, she did not want it poured into her, to burn her" (TR 168). His phallic intrusion can be coincided with the dominant classes' rape of the subservient class. As the economically inferior base cannot resist the power of the superstructure, Anna cannot overcome Will's masculine power. Lawrence does not focus this scene on female ravagement, but rather the loss of power and possible inferiority associated with breaking away from the perceived ideology. Despite Anna and Will's strained relationship, their daughter Ursula enters the world and brought them both temporary happiness.

As the strain of motherhood takes hold of Anna, Will reaches an epiphany through the grace of fatherhood. However, Will begins to notice the opposition of his

traditional ideals to those of his idealistic bride. After visiting his childhood home, Nottingham, Will views the world at an elevated religious level.

Bragwen felt that the whole of the man's world was exterior and extraneous to his own real life with Anna. Sweep away the whole monstrous superstructure of the world today, cities and industries and civilization, leave only the bare earth with plants growing and waters running, and he would not mind, so long as he were whole, had Anna the child and the new, strange certainty in his soul (TR 179).

Through fatherhood and his trip to Nottingham, Will reinvests his central position in the social machine. Anna changes his life and aids in expanding his religious commitment to the critique of the superstructure.

As Will's spiritual search continues, the couple journeys off to Lincoln Cathedral; "he had promised her that one by one, they should visit all the cathedrals in England" (TR 186). The moment the two enter the religious building, their separate identities surface. Amongst Will's excitement, Anna is filled with rage. Rather than enjoy the holy sanctuary, she begins to feel trapped. Will's emotions regarding the beauty of the altar are countered by Anna's view of an altar that "was barren, its lights gone out. God burned no more in that bush. It was dead matter lying there. She claimed the right to freedom above her, higher than the roof. She had always a sense of being roofed in" (TR 189). The Cathedral represents differing symbolic meanings for the two. Will views the church as the building of benediction whereas Anna can only digest the stagnant atmosphere as a direct symbol of the social sphere. Anna will not allow herself to become trapped within the normative values of the culture.

As the scene continues, Lawrence reintroduces the notion of Adam and Eve's fall from grace in Will's depiction of Anna as the "voice of the serpent in his Eden" (TR 189). She taunts him by pointing at a male statue and deeming it female. However, Lawrence constructs Anna as the deceptive serpent rather than the naïve Eve. Their interchange in the church suggests that Anna desires to be released from her husband's "Eden" where as Will is a character with no true spiritual development. At this point, the characters become truly aware of their opposition to each other's belief systems and venture to satisfy their personal needs. Anna becomes engulfed in her child while Will devotes his energy to the church. Although their views on traditional values and individuality differ, they remain married and satisfied only through the intense mutual yearning for the physical side of their physical love. Ten months after the birth of their first child, Ursula, Anna becomes pregnant.

While Ursula becomes Will's ultimate priority, Anna spends her days weaning the new child, Gudrun. Will constantly refers to Gudrun as "it." His relationship with the elder child flourishes since she is not in need of Anna's breast any longer for survival. As Lawrence explores the bond between Will and Ursula, he mimics the family dynamic of the previous generation. The family continues to expand to include Theresa and Catherine. As the Bragwen children multiply, Will becomes disturbed by his present situation and imagines the life of adultery. One evening after a trip to Nottingham, he meets a woman and engages in a friendly walk in the rain. During their brief encounter, Will begins kissing her and enters into a "world to himself, he had nothing to do with any general consciousness. Just his own senses were supreme" (TR 213). Anna, like the serpent, has indirectly prompted the suspension of Will's ideology and ultimate

indiscretion. Just as Anna's stepfather, Tom, sought out the company of a prostitute to gain power that he did not possess in his daily life so does Will in this scene. Will is unable to achieve a position of power within his marriage and attempts to achieve it through the sexual relations with another woman. Anna and Will's "love had become, a sensuality violent and extreme as death" (TR 220). Will returns home to his wife and children and mentions nothing of the incident. Their twisted relationship and uneven division of power roles consumes their consciousness and prompts them to view their children as "mere offspring to them, they lived in the darkness and death of their own sexual activities" (TR 219).

Ursula, barely eight years old, and Gudrun, seven, become merely ornaments in their parents' home. During this same year, Tom Bragwen, Anna's stepfather, dies and shatters the masculine utopia at the Marsh Farm. As the rain pours down and saturates the drunken Bragwen elder, it floods the area near the horse stables and captures Tom in Mother Nature's grasp. The water strikes his leg and sends him into a watery death. This incident alters the perceptions of the Bragwen family. The family is now aware of the ultimate superstructure, God. Although religion is inbred in the acceptable social structure, this random act of God dismembers the social machine and releases a world that is not always under the control of the acceptable standards. Tom's sudden death disrupts the characters' former ideals. It also gives Will a new appreciation and love for his bride.

Will and Anna's family continue to grow with the addition of Billy and Cassandra. As Ursula grows older, she is expected to assume the role of the eldest child. Gudrun and Ursula become inseparable, which creates the bond that Lawrence later

develops in *Women in Love*. During their high school years, Ursula comes forth as a self-efficient individual who is attempting to create her own existence free from the constraints of hegemony while Gudrun emerges as a shy, timid creature with aspirations of disappearing into her own world. Both children do not appear to conduct themselves in coherence with the mainstream. Their father constantly subjects them to his religious notions. Yet, Ursula cannot appreciate her father's devotion to the church nor her mother's opposition to religion. As Ursula shifts from girlhood to womanhood, she becomes aware that "she was a separate entity in the midst of an unseparated obscurity, that she must go somewhere, she must become something" (TR 263).

She begins to question life and her purpose on this earth. Attempting to assess her position amidst the battling beliefs of her parents, she ponders the responsibility that one has to as well as oneself.

How to act, that was the question? Whither to go, how to become oneself? One was not oneself, one was merely a half-stated question. How to become oneself, how to know the question and the answer of oneself, when one was merely an unfixed something-nothing, blowing about like the winds of heaven, undefined, unstated (TR 264).

Ursula engages in a constant internal battle with religion. She becomes enraged by her quest for personal knowledge. It is during this period that the sixteen-year-old encounters young Anton Skrebensky. Baron Skrebensky, a friend of Ursula's grandmother, and his young son are mentioned in an earlier chapter during Anna's youth. She becomes immediately taken with the young man because he seems to be "finely constituted, and so distinct, self-contained, self-supporting. This, she said to herself, was a gentleman, he

had a nature like fate, the nature of an aristocrat" (TR 265). Skrebensky becomes initially described as individualistic spirit; he was self-efficient. However, Ursula's comment regarding his demeanor places him in a category of aristocracy as well as labels Ursula as a hypnotized follower of the hegemony. She cannot merely assess his positive qualities as beneficial to his character but rather she must bracket his traits to fit into her frame of reference, thereby placing him in the aristocracy class.

The placement of Skrebensky into a socially acceptable category releases Ursula's traditional core. As her adoration for him grows, she begins to devote her energy to her physical demeanor. Ursula becomes the stereotypical domestic damsel. In her desire to satisfy Skrebensky in accordance to the social machine, Ursula asserts that she must be beautiful and focuses her energy towards the production of new clothes and the enhancement of her physical appearance. Her notions of female and male courtship hinder her relationship in the later novel, *Women in Love*, with Birkin. However, Lawrence's depiction of the domestic female gains the attention of Skrebensky. Throughout their exchanges at the Marsh, Anton and Ursula passionately kiss and enjoy each other's company. They as well both travel separately to London, locate each other and continue the passionate rendezvous. The young love continues as the two venture toward different destinations.

Ursula returns to school to finish her last two terms. The strength exerted in her childhood is replaced by fear and uncertainty. She shrinks in the midst of people and desires to be liked by all. By relying on the opinions of the masses to create her identity, "she had no self" (TR 311). Ursula is the prototype for a society driven by acceptable standards and beliefs, which composes the mainstream ideology. Her childhood

indifference to social norms is void from her nature and has been adopted by Gudrun. Ursula seeks for the approval of Miss Winifred Inger, her class mistress as well as her peers. Soon the search for acceptance from her class mistress turns into a love affair. The two kiss and engage in an intimate relationship that forever alters Ursula. The romantic contact between the two does not stem from a purely sexual attraction but rather a blurring of the socially accepted standards. Ursula's need to be accepted by the superstructure leads her into the arms of Winifred. However, Winifred does not function within a mandated ideology and as a result influenced Ursula from her humanistic standpoint. Winifred discusses the fallacy of religion and the power of the women's movement with Ursula. Ursula is trapped within a new realm that she does not fully understand.

It was a strange world the girl was swept into, like a chaos, like the end of the world. She was too young to understand it all. Yet the inoculation passed into her, through her love for her mistress. (TR 318).

School came to a close, as did Ursula's desire to be romantically involved with her teacher. Although she still is in love with Ms. Ingram, Ursula now desires to assist her in obtaining an acceptable union with her Uncle Tom. Since the educational atmosphere is lost, Ursula is forced to relinquish the social blemishes of college, her same sex affair, and once again join acceptable society. Upon the engagement and marriage of Winifred and Tom, Ursula grows bitter and eventually accepts the notion that the two will flourish together within the social machine.

He would let the machinery carry him: husband, father, pit-manager, warm clay

lifted through the recurrent action of the day after day by the great machine from which it derived its motion. As for Winifred, she was an educated woman, and of the same sort as himself. She would make a good companion. She was his mate (TR 327).

Both now became working parts of the machine.

As Ursula transitions from school and Winifred to home life and the possibility of marriage, she finds herself in constant opposition to her mother. She becomes a bit numb to the happenings of the world. As a war rages on in South Africa, she barely seems to be concerned about Skrebensky who is in the midst of battle. The memory of Skrebensky is a “symbol of her real life...through him, she may return to her own self, which she was before she had loved Winifred...” (TR 331). The socially acceptable image of Skrebensky erases her passions for the nontraditional affair she had in college. The faded memories of her first love are too unclear and prompt her to search for something meaningful. She searches to find a position as a schoolmistress. Her parents, especially her father, are enraged by her decision to pick up a vocation, seeing it as futile due to the family’s wealth. Her choice to do so against her parent’s wishes challenges the patriarchal familial structure. Will’s role in the family is the breadwinner. Should Ursula obtain a job, it would reflect negatively upon his part in the social machine.

Upon realizing Ursula’s determination to obtain a position that may send her away from home, Will seeks to arrange for her employment at a school in a neighboring town, Brinsley School. Once employed, Ursula soon becomes aware that “this prison of a school was reality...She winced, feeling she had been a fool in her anticipations” (TR 347). She is overwhelmed by the reality of her present position. Weeks pass and she

does not become comfortable with her position in the school. The headmaster, Mr. Harby, becomes the root of her negative reactions to her teaching position. He silently watches her conduct lessons and monitors her every action. Mr. Harby is a commodified figure. His sole contribution in life is his teaching ability. Ursula describes him as an “invincible source of the mechanism he kept all power himself. And the class owned his power. And in school, it was power and power alone that mattered” (TR 351). The school becomes symbolic of a society that respects those with power; the children in the classroom act as the subservient class that are commodified by Mr. Harby, the dominant patriarchal figure. Mr. Harby is as well devalued in the machine society. He is no longer seen as an individual, but rather becomes valued as merely a commodity.

Although Ursula's dissatisfaction with her role within the economic machine continues, she begins to feel self-sufficient; she is now financially independent from her mother and father. However, her economic freedom from her parents forces her to become a function of the social machine. While teaching and under the stress of Mr. Harby's surveillance, she is taunted by a rowdy student, Williams, threatens to send him to Mr. Harby, and upon his continuous outbursts, she snatches him from his seat and beats him with a cane. It is apparent that “something went click in Ursula's soul” and the child suffered her built-up wrath for the system (TR3 70). Rather than scold Ursula, as she desires to be reprimanded, for her actions, Mr. Harby insists “if you settle Clarke and Letts in the same way, Miss Bragwen, you'll be alright” (TR 372). Ursula now assumes two roles in life; she is William Bragwen's daughter and Standard Five Teacher in St. Phillip's School. Ursula's contact within and against the superstructure will forever alter her character.

She was afraid, and strange. It was to her quite strange and ugly, like some dream where she was degraded. She would have died rather than admit it to anybody. She could not look at her swollen hand. Something had broken in her; she had passed a crisis. Williams was beaten, but at a cost (TR 372).

Throughout her time at the school, Ursula wishes to be accepted and fulfill the expectations placed upon her by Mr. Harby. After the beating of Williams, she will no longer allow her soul to be in crisis due to the superstructure. She has briefly given in to her role within the mechanical environment and will not allow herself to become a part in Mr. Harby's educational machine; "she was not going to be prisoner in the dry, tyrannical man-world" (TR 380-381). Unfortunately, Williams is a casualty in Ursula's war with herself. Freeing herself from this world, she returns home and learns that her father is offered an instructor position in Nottingham. Allowing the mainstream mentality to cloud her mind, she becomes excited and "dreams of the new place she would live in, where stately cultured people of high feeling would be friends with her, and she would live with the noble in the land, moving to a large freedom of feeling" (TR 389). Her experience with Winifred and in her teaching position programs Ursula continues to search for a socially acceptable existence.

As the novel closes, Ursula ventures off to college while Gudrun attends art school in Nottingham. Ursula enjoys college and begins to become self-conscious regarding her exterior persona once again to attract male suitors. After the first year, Ursula becomes impatient with the role of college.

It was a second-hand dealer's shop, and one bought an equipment for an examination. This was only a little side-show to the factories of the town.

Gradually the perception stole into her. This was no religious retreat, no seclusion of pure learning. It was a little apprentice-shop where one was further equipped for making money. The college itself was a little, slovenly laboratory for the factory (TR403).

She becomes aware of the reification process and views the schools as factory breeding commodified persons.

During her last year at college, Skrebensky reenters her life. On leave, he goes to Ursula at college and both profess their love for one another. This leads to several visits from Anton. During one of their meetings, their passionate kissing evolves into lovemaking. She does not become ashamed but rather is revived and becomes stronger. As a result of their affair, Anton asks her to marry him and she declines. Although Ursula's love for him is undeniable, "she owned his body and enjoyed it with all the delight and carelessness of possessor" (TR 426). Through their relationship, she has made Anton a sexual commodity. His worth is only valued through his position and that is not in the role of a husband. Ursula reveals her sentiments on love when questioned regarding her emotions for Anton.

I don't care about love. I don't value it. I don't care whether I love or whether I don't, whether I have love or whether I haven't (TR 440).

Lawrence explores and challenges her final sentiments on the dominant culture ideal of love.

As *The Rainbow* comes to a close, the generations of the novel are exposed. The happenings of the previous novel allow for *Women in Love* to emerge. Within *The Rainbow*, "Lawrence analyzes the way in which the fundamental experiences of life-

birth, marriage, sex, and death-register on the obscurely emotional, instinctive self: *The Rainbow* is a recapitulation of the life-cycle... *Women in Love* is replaced with specific images of inner being" (Ben-Ephraim 181). Although *Women in Love* is obviously the sequel to *The Rainbow*, the novels differ on many levels. The internal focus on the characters' existence within the social sphere as well as the actual composition differs from the original novel to its successor. However, the overwhelming parallels between Lawrence's depictions of the individual within society to Marxist ideals are prevalent throughout both novels. As we shift from *The Rainbow* to *Women in Love*, it is important to recognize that "the expanding symbol of the rainbow... has a surplus of meaning" and the questions purposed regarding the development of the characters in the first novel are in part answered in *Women in Love* (Balbert, *Psychology of Rhythm* 27). Ursula has begun to look towards the future while Gudrun slowly emerges from the shadows as the characters conclude *The Rainbow* and move into new relationships in *Women in Love*; "*The Rainbow* can be read as complete in itself. Yet without going on to read *Women in Love*, one misses not only another great novel but an enhanced understanding of *The Rainbow* itself" (Hoggart 71). The happenings of the previous novel shall act as the foundation for the Marxist critique of Lawrence's later portrayal of the third generation Bragwen family's place within the superstructure and the ideology surrounding an era engulfed by war.

Composed in the shadows of World War I, "*Women in Love* would be his finest rejection of society, his most complex statement of attitude to the prevailing ideology, his own most intense ideological statement: his realization of the contradictions of his own position as man and writer" (Worthen 85). Lawrence sought for an escape from the war-

influenced existence that plagued England. Believing in the strength of a solely individual existence, he envisioned the power of the individual surpassing the constructions of a conventional society. *Women in Love* appears to be a response to the deterioration of traditional values inflicted by the war “and for Lawrence they were a way out of the contradictory feelings which the War imposed on him. In the age of the mass, authoritarian state, he wanted to assert the integrity of the free individual; but he also wished to create and live the life of a community” (Worthen 84). Although images of the war are never introduced into the novel, Lawrence creates characters that are searching, like Europe in World War I, for their place in the world. Through his writings, Lawrence is able to create a new world composed of his ideas of individualism as well as a Marxist desire to subvert the established society.

Within *Women in Love*, there are constant struggles between the social ideology and Lawrence’s construction of the individual. Once among the Criches and selected guests, who are gathered at the Shortlands for a wedding party, the reader is introduced to the opposing constructs of society. Rupert Birkin emerges immediately upon his introduction into Chapter II as the voice of the individual. While talking with Mrs. Crich, “he was tense, feeling that he and the elderly, estranged woman were conferring together like traitors, like enemies within the camp of other people” (WL 24). The duo band together in alliance to oppose the gathering of the meaningless masses. Birkin exclaims, “people don’t really matter” and is pressured to explain, “not many people are anything at all...they jingle and giggle. It would be much better if they were just wiped out. Essentially, they don’t exist, they aren’t there” (WL 24-25). This brief interchange between the characters establishes the critique of traditional social atmosphere that

directs the novel as well as allows an individual to protest the confines of the power structure. Fredric Jameson, author of *The Political Unconscious*, "insists that the ostensible privileging of the private over the public that is central to the bourgeois individualism actually impoverishes private life by obscuring the domination of the individual by capitalism and creating a false illusion of individual autonomy" (Booker 80). As a result, the characters Birkin encounters are the products of capitalism and function, as Jameson would suggest through the bourgeois individualism. Lawrence reveals that the facade of the individuality ultimately "maims our existence as individual subjects and paralyzes our thinking" (Booker 80).

As the party progresses, several characters enter into a discussion regarding patriotism, nationality, and race. Gerald Crich, using a hat as symbolic of a nation, questions Hermione regarding the measures she would take to ensure the liberty of her hat. The two argue the validity of the symbol being used while Birkin interjects that "it is open for me to decide, which is a greater loss to me, my hat, or my liberty as a free and indifferent man. If I am compelled to offer fight, I lose the latter. It is a question which is worth more to me, my pleasant liberty of conduct, or my hat" (WL 29). Birkin is unable to support the "nationalistic old hat" while Gerald defends it and Hermione would kill for it. Lawrence has set the tone for the entire novel within the first two chapters. Opposing the political warfare, justified by capitalist materialism, supported by the other characters, Birkin replaces the need to rule over others as means of personal fulfillment with a strong sense of himself as an individual. In a letter written to Lady Ottoline, a year before the writing of *Women in Love*, Lawrence professed his hope for a promising future that "shall start a new life amongst us-a life in which the only riches are integrity

of character. So that each one may fulfill his own nature and deep desires to the utmost..." (Bentley 71). Lawrence has created Birkin as an image of the bourgeois construction of the individual that creates a false sense of autonomy, as suggested by Jameson.

Through early interactions with Gerald, Birkin questions the ideology that consumes the characters in the novel. Chapter V, "In The Train," discloses Birkin opposing the hegemony that Gerald encompasses. During this train ride, the characters begin to discuss the newspaper and essentially disclose the probing issues of *Women in Love*. Birkin has a tainted view of society.

We are such dreary liars. Our one idea is to lie to ourselves. We have an ideal of a perfect world, clean and straight and sufficient. So we cover the earth with foulness, life is a blotch of labour, like insects scurrying in filth, so that your collier can have a pianoforte in his parlour, and you can have a butler and a motor-car in your up-to-date house, and as a nation we can sport the Ritz... (WL 55)

Birkin is appalled at the superstructure that functions to "legitimate the power of the social class which owns the means of economic production" (Eagleton 5). He fails to view the logic in the bourgeois thought process and condemns those who adhere to the ideology that fuels the social machine, justified by the acquisition of material possessions.

Lawrence's references to a pianoforte, butler, and motor-car to symbolize the commodification of all things. Those seeking status purchase a motor-car to function as a symbol of social positioning. Although these commodities have an actual use value, they

are valued more for their exchange value. In this instance, it is the exchange of social acknowledgement because "it makes him so much higher in his neighbouring colliers' eyes" (WL 55). Also, Lawrence begins to hint at the commodification of the working class in Birkin's speech. By introducing the position of a butler as a valuable object to obtain, Lawrence begins to disclose "the nature of a capitalist economy, which treats the labor of individuals as a source of commodities, eventually leads to the treatment of human beings as abstract economic quantities, again valued not for their own individual characteristics but for their economic function" (Booker 74). According to Lawrence and Birkin, Gerald works to purchase objects that enhance his position in society, and dehumanizes lower classes.

However, Gerald is unable to appreciate the argument supplied by Birkin's attack on the capitalist class system and asserts that the symbols are "a real desire for something higher" (WL 55). Christianity as presented by Lawrence and viewed by Marx is simply another form of ideology that ultimately supports capital, thus Gerald's statements expose him as a superstructure construction. Trying to eliminate Gerald's skepticism, Birkin attempts to make him recognize his own position in the realm of the so-called issues that receive a heightened state of importance. Lawrence as well forces the reader to move beyond capitalism to individualism. Although Lawrence's attack on the economic workings parallel Marxist ideals, his solution differs by placing the individual in control of willing his own existence. Rejecting the established ideas of the ruling class, Birkin denounces the purchasing of objects as symbolic power "to view the reflection of himself in the human opinion" and professes to Gerald "you do the same. If you are of high importance to humanity you are of high importance to yourself" (WL 55). Attempting to

replace the ideology with an individualistic approach, Birkin condemns Gerald for functioning in accordance to the masses. He accuses Gerald of working hard at the mines for economic gain and social status. This places him no higher than those obtaining objects of status. By producing "coal to cook five thousand dinners a day, you are five thousand times more important than if you cooked only your own dinner" (WL 55). Birkin, being a creation of the ideals of the Modernist era, thinks it futile to perform these duties and proclaims, "first person singular is enough for me" (WL 56).

Throughout their previous conversation as well as their relationship, they are unable to function according to the same thought process. Each man is incapable of comprehending the others' thoughts on life. Gerald believes that a man must have a purpose for being whereas Birkin faults the means of productivity as a symbol of purpose. The men seem to be talking at each other without be able to converse. Once they have expressed their beliefs and thoughts, they are compelled to rebut the contradictory thoughts of their opponent and they never attempt to resolve their differences. Their intelligent conversation regarding productivity results in Birkin's revelation that "there are odd moments when I hate you starrily" and Gerald responds with equal hatred (WL 56). Lawrence has allowed the reader to view men of equal intelligence suffering the pitfalls of what Karl Marx terms "alienation." Since Birkin is a modestly wealthy intellectual who functions as a school superintendent through the first few chapters and Gerald directs and later owns his father's coal-mines, the two are unable to successfully communicate as a result of the division of labor, Birkin holding the position as the worker and Gerald fulfilling the Capitalist role. Birkin and Gerald "become distanced from each other by virtue of the differences in their everyday

activities" (Booker 73). Although they function at the same parties and remain in similar social circles, the two are estranged from each other simply through their different roles in the labor force. As suggested earlier, Birkin, being the novel's voice, recognizes the alienation between himself and Gerald. However, Gerald appears absentminded to all issues that have not been sanctioned by the social order. The absence of free thought in Gerald is alarming to an individual like Birkin. By being consumed by his trade, Gerald has lost the ability to think for himself. Birkin attempts to release Gerald from the confinement of his existence by proclaiming, "humanity doesn't embody the utterance of the incomprehensible any more. Humanity is a dead letter. There will be a new embodiment, in a new way. Let humanity disappear as quick as possible" (WL 59). Humanity is the result of the social machine and suppresses the development of the individual.

As the novel progresses, Lawrence exposes the social suffocation of his characters through the spectrum of humanity. Upon being introduced to the Brangwen sisters in Chapter VIII, Gerald is informed by Hermoine, a personification of the obnoxious bourgeois class, that they are "teachers in the Grammar school... Gudrun art mistress, Ursula a class mistress" (WL 93). Hermoine's spiteful description of the Brangwens is followed by the crude announcement that "class-barriers are breaking down" (WL 94). Lawrence integrates class friction between the characters in this novel as a "necessary part of his study of a dying culture" (Mackillop 47). With World War I altering Europe, Lawrence creates a paradoxical social setting that continues to thrive on the insignificant values of days past. His social critique ventures beyond the typical attack on the hierarchal class system, but rather painfully explores a self-absorbed society that seems to

be resisting change. The war has altered everything and yet the reader must recognize the shifting ideals through Birkin's quest for individualism because World War I does not explicitly appear on any page. Through excluding images and details about the war in *Women in Love*, Lawrence is able to construct a superstructure that the reader shall question and as a result look to Birkin as their knowledgeable voice.

Exploring the function of ideology in this "dying era," Lawrence often integrates an explosive conversation between the main characters to expose their means of thought. Hermoine, Ursula, Gudrun, Gerald, and Birkin, each representing a different role in society, begin to discuss "the whole quite intellectual and artificial, about a new state, a new world of man. Supposing this old social state were broken and destroyed, then, out of the chaos, what then" (WL 102)? As Lawrence applies questions of his own society to his fiction, he is able to imagine the collapse of the superstructure. Gerald's solution to the possibility of a new social state is simply that "only work, the business of production, held men together. It was mechanical, but then society was a mechanism. Apart from work they were isolated, free to do as they liked" (WL 102). Again, his vision of free men is quite contradictory to Birkin's ideals. If the society is nothing but a mechanism, those working within it shall become machines as well. Valued only for the products they produce, workers become commodities. Being a part of a social machine, men are devalued as individuals and strictly valued for their production ability.

Gudrun disagrees with Gerald's vision of man and deems it a dehumanizing process that shall lead to the replacement of names with a person's position, such as "Mr. Colliery-Manager Crich," like the Germans. Gudrun is aware of the faults in Gerald's plan, which results in the commodification of the worker. Lawrence seems to be

condemning Gerald's view through paralleling his construction of social order with the Germans. If Gerald's picturesque society resumed, it would reflect a civilization much like England's enemy in war, Germany. Trying to elevate the political confrontation between Gudrun and Gerald, Hermoine naively wishes for mankind to realize "that in spirit we are all one, all equal in spirit, all brothers there-the rest wouldn't matter, there would be no more of this carping and envy and this struggle for power, which destroys only destroys" (WL 103). Being a self-absorbed member of the upper class, Hermoine has not been exposed to the workings of the social sphere and believes that all mankind can unite in harmony. However, Birkin being a realist would not allow this comment to be stated without a profound rebuttal. He agrees that man's basic needs ally them as equal creatures; we must all eat, breathe, sleep, and drink. However, he denounces her vision of democracy as an absolute lie because her idea regarding "brotherhood of man is a pure falsity, if you apply it further than the mathematical abstraction. We all drank milk first, we all eat bread and eat meat...therein lies the beginning and end of the brotherhood of man. But no equality"(WL 103). Birkin does not feel the need to compare and combine all men because then there shall always be discrepancy. He wishes for a state that is established to allow all men to be "as separate as one star from another, as different in quality and quantity" (WL 103). Although the characters vary in their opinions, none can "deny the reality of the external world, its gradual transformation from the Old England into the New..." (Oates 225).

It appears that Gerald is intent on creating a new more productive England. Within Chapter XVII, The Industrial Magnate, Lawrence explores Gerald's desire for a mechanical society. At this point in the novel, Mr. Crich, Gerald's father, is severely ill

and unable to continue his position at the mines. He has devoted his life to loving "his neighbor even better than himself-which is going one further than the commandment" (WL 215). Treating his miners kindly, Mr. Crich "felt inferior to them, as if they, through poverty and labour, were nearer to God than he" (WL 215). Once the position of power is relinquished to Gerald, "he laid hold of the world. Now at last he saw his own name written on the wall. Now he had a vision of power" (WL 222). Gerald did not attempt to mirror his father's example, but rather become the master of his mechanical society. The tension between father and son mirrors the friction imposed on the uprising of a new more industrial society by the old regime.

There had always been opposition between the two of them. Gerald had feared and despised his father, and to great extent had avoided him all through boyhood and young manhood. And the father had felt very often a real dislike of his eldest son, which, never wanting to give way to, he had refused to acknowledge. He had ignored Gerald as much as possible, leaving him alone. (WL 218)

The negative feelings Gerald has harbored for his father becomes symbolic of the new versus old England. Being completely removed and alienated from his son, Mr. Crich functions through a different ideology. Their inability to coexist is rooted within the altering stages of England through the varying generations.

Gerald is unable to view England's production through the methods of his father's generation. In search of a new method to enhance the means of production, Gerald eliminates the aristocratic approach his father displayed and replaces it with a mechanical soul. Viewing his men as "ugly and uncouth," Gerald did not care what they thought of

him (WL 223). He did not intend to obtain the coal miners as friends nor even treat them as men. Rather, his intentions relied upon achieving maximum production with limited costs. This production plan did not allow for special treatment for the workers. Placing himself in a superior role, "they were his instruments. He was the god of the machine" (WL 223). The miners were no longer viewed as men but simply instruments to provide for the economic structure of society. Through the commodification of the workers, Gerald "had conceived the pure instrumentality of mankind. The sufferings and feelings of individuals did not matter in the least. They were mere conditions, like the weather" (WL 223). These miners were no longer men with families in need of the finances achieved from mining; they became parts of Gerald's machine. By creating an industry run as a machine, "the mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness" (Eagleton 4). A society encompassing Gerald's beliefs creates men without an ability to independently exist.

At first, the men desire to murder Gerald Crich for his inhumane tactics, but as time passes, they begin to succumb to the workings of the machine. They have been commodified and essentially thank Gerald for aiding their human development and promoting their material welfare. Throughout the novel, Lawrence sends each of his characters on a personal quest. The workers have been contained by the superstructure and deprogrammed of their ability to think freely, which is replaced by the power of the economic machine. The man whom they once despised for making their jobs much harder than before is now being celebrated as their hero.

Gerald was their high priest, he represented the religion they really felt. His father was forgotten already. There was a new world, a new order, strict, terrible, inhuman, but satisfying in its very destructiveness. The men were satisfied to belong to the great and wonderful machine, even whilst it destroyed them. It was what they wanted, it was the highest that man had produced, the most wonderful and superhuman. They were exalted by belonging to this great and superhuman system which was beyond feeling or reason, something really godlike. (WL 231)

The mechanical religion established by Gerald resembles that of a cult. Members of the cult society function towards a main objective without feeling or reason for their actions. The mechanical society has taken hold of the workers and produced wealth at the expense of the commodified souls. The ability to rape men of their spirit through the economic production process places the superstructure in control of man's free will. This produces a "structure of social perception that ensures that the situation in which one social class has power over the others either seen by most members of the society as 'natural' or not seen at all" (Eagleton 5).

Trying to escape the numbing existence created by Gerald, Gudrun has ventured beyond the superstructure to an artistic world of painting. Although the reader is introduced to her novel as an art mistress for Gerald's sister, she has spent a substantial amount of time in London pursuing her painting. She has relied upon the paintbrush to free her from the socially directed external world. There are other characters mentioned in the novel who wish, like Gudrun, to escape the social machine through art. However, Lawrence's depiction of the Bohemian culture does not depict an ideal alternative to Gerald's mechanical vision. Birkin describes them as being "painters, musicians,

writers...anybody who is openly out with the conventions, and belongs to nowhere particularly" (WL 60). Rather than idealizing the freeness of the Bohemian lifestyle, Lawrence faults it for having no structure. They simply exist for their art without any individualized motivating force. Their rejection of the established society is not substituted with a concise reformation but rather "they live only in the gesture of rejection and negation-but negatively something, at any rate" (WL 60). Although Gudrun is not overtly connected to the Bohemian set, she, as an artist, views the world through a similar vantage point. Unable to free herself from the established culture and subculture, Gudrun is incapable of experiencing an individualistic existence. By constructing Gudrun, an artist, in opposition to Gerald, she is symbolic of the "unequal relationship of the development of material production...to artistic development" (Eagleton 11). The social machine embraces economic growth while the artist can only gain acceptance through the Bohemian culture. However, Lawrence creates subverts Gudrun's role as an artist and places her economically dependent upon Gerald, who hires her to tutor his sister.

Lawrence, in addition to his discussion of the dehumanization of the worker, and displacement of the artist, explores the issue of marriage as being an extension of the social consciousness constructed by the ideology of the reigning superstructure. The central theme within the novel is the characters' construction of love and marriage. Being an extension of their social position, the characters depict varying images of matrimony. Lawrence has paired Gudrun and Gerald, and Birkin and Ursula to expose the reader to the different constructions of love. Through their self-conception of the

era's ideology, each character portrays dissimilar emotions regarding love and marriage. Their idea of love is strongly influenced by their personal beliefs in the ideology.

The relationship that transpires between Gudrun and Gerald is directly affected by the clashing ideals of the artistic world and the mechanical creation. It is unnatural for individuals holding separate ideals of the superstructure to attempt to conjoin. From the beginning of their relationship, there is a violent component to their interactions. Each conversation develops into an argument of contrasting ideals. As the two interact, hostile conversations develop into physical attacks. Within Chapter XIV, Water-Party, Gerald and Gudrun are enjoying a glorious afternoon on a secluded area of property when the harmless arguing becomes violent. As Gudrun dances and taunts the long-horned bullocks, her internal beliefs begin to conflict with Gerald's ideals. Viewing the world as following a specific order, Gerald is unable to conceive of her erratic behavior. He perceives the world through his own adaptation of the ideology and cannot appreciate Gudrun's behavior.

Chasing the cattle up the hill, Gudrun argues with Gerald regarding her ability to drive them mad. He relies upon his mechanized mind to alleviate the situation by announcing his ownership of the cattle and offering to send her one later. Within Gerald's thought process, his offer places himself in a dominant role while still allowing Gudrun to achieve her ultimate goal of obtaining a bullock. However, Gudrun is not interested in owning or ruling anyone or anything, which makes Gerald's offer less than appealing. It is her artistic freedom and the desire to suspend established order that drives Gudrun after the cattle. The conversation reaches a climax when Gudrun leans forward and "swung round her arm, catching him a light blow on the face with the back

of her hand. And she felt in her soul an unconquerable desire for deep violence against him" (WL 170). Gerald countered her attack by uttering, "you have struck the first blow" as if to foreshadow future violence (WL 171). Since Gerald and Gudrun do not encompass the traits of traditional volatile characters with explosive personalities, the violent behavior displayed in this scene results from the collaboration of two misplaced individuals in their quest for the new England. Lawrence alleviates Gudrun's temper by blaming Gerald as she states, "it's you who make me behave like this" (WL 171). She has not defined herself as an individual, which causes her strong reaction to his overpowering opposition. Although she does not function according to the superstructure, she has not replaced the established ideology with her own. Like the Bohemians, Gudrun opposes the era's concepts, but has not attempted to construct a revised version. Gerald, being completely infatuated with order, threatens Gudrun's way of life. Through his ability to conduct order at the mines and mechanize his workers, she does not endanger his existence, but rather poses a challenge. As she opposes Gerald, he vows his love and affection. This relationship is incapable of prospering.

The reader follows Gerald and Gudrun through their hopeless journey. As their tale comes to a finale, the violent opposition between the duo turns fatal. Her earlier infatuation with Gerald has been replaced by the lifestyle that Gerald represents. The chapter devoted to their love connection is titled Death and Love. Lawrence establishes that Gudrun and Gerald cannot share the intangible emotion of love without the reality of death impeding. The night that they spent together in her bed was in darkness. As the candlelight illuminates the room, Gudrun felt humiliated to watch him dress. It is in the illumination of her thought that she realizes that "it is like a workman getting up to go to

work...and I am like a workman's wife. But an ache like nausea was upon her: a nausea of him" (WL 348). She is completely alienated from him.

The characters' alienation intensifies during their trip to the snow-filled mountains. Often, Gudrun glances at Gerald to evaluate his character.

He had the faculty of making order out of confusion. Only let him grip hold of a situation, and he would bring to pass an inevitable conclusion...Gerald with his force of will and his power for comprehending the actual world, should be set to solve the problems of the day, the problem of industrialism in the modern world. She knew he would, in the course of time, effect the changes he desired, he could re-organise the industrial system. (WL 417)

Gudrun recognizes the power that Gerald has to overcome any situation. Reflecting different ideals, Gudrun does not wish to be "re-organised" like an industrial system. As she begins to drift further from Gerald, Gudrun encounters Loerke, an artist. It is not accidental that Lawrence presents Loerke as an artist. Lawrence introduces an ally for Gudrun's artistic soul because Loerke "expresses a view of art that all artists share, to some extent, despite their protestations to the contrary" (Oates 229). Through their brief interactions, she becomes infatuated with him and his views. Upon discussing his art, Loerke places sculpture and architecture together and insists that "since industry is our business, now, then let us make our places of industry our art" (WL 424). Loerke is aware of the importance of industrialization to fulfill the basic human needs, but does not view machines in accordance to the ideals of the superstructure rather he views the beauty in the mechanisms. His art inspired view on life extracts him from the mechanical society and Gudrun wishes for the same existence. Symbolically, the combining of

Gudrun and Loerke's similar artistic ideals becomes an overpowering force that has the ability to annihilate Gerald's mechanical society. Once the masses begin to adhere to certain ideals those in opposition fall at their mercy. As a result of Gudrun and Gerald's violent encounters and Loerke's symbolic force, Gerald wills his own death by being exposed to the winter elements and freezes to death. Their union ceases to exist.

Birkin and Ursula's union does not follow the destructive path of Gudrun and Gerald's relationship, but rather is compelled along through their ideal of love. Birkin's vision of marriage reflects the individualistic thought process that equally fuels his opinions on politics and economics. He does not desire to engage in a marriage as dictated by the patriarchal construction. Rather than obtaining a bride to marginalize, he ventures beyond the established notion of marriage and constructs an individualistic approach. Although it may seem impossible to remain an individualist within the sanctions of marriage, Birkin is able to eventually persuade Ursula and the reader of his plan for an ideal union. She does not adhere to his radical interpretation of marriage at first. Questioning every statement, Ursula cannot imagine a marriage without love. He does not intend to offer love "because it isn't love he wants. It is something much more impersonal and harder, -and rarer" (WL 145). Through negating the traditional components of love, he is able to express that "I want to find you, were you don't know your own existence, the you that your common self denies utterly. But I don't want your good looks, and I don't want your womanly feelings, and I don't want your thoughts nor opinions nor your ideas" (WL 147). Birkin desires to transcend the romantic bourgeois ideology that has plagued the other characters and society to reach an enlightened level. Not allowing himself to commodify or marginalize his bride, Birkin envisions a marriage

composed of a higher intellectual connection. He finds it disgusting when "people marry for a home" (WL 152). Trying to appease Ursula, he professes his love but does not relinquish his beliefs.

As their conversation regarding marriage resurfaces, Birkin and Ursula begin to enter into a similar disagreement. Ursula is aware of her need to marry a suitable mate. She is unsure and skeptical about Birkin's idea of marriage and proceeds to unleash her internal thoughts. In essence, she becomes aware of the hypocrisy in his argument regarding marriage and accuses him of seeking a power relation that duplicates the superstructure.

You want the paradisaal unknowing. You want me to be your thing, never to criticize you or have anything to say for myself. You want me to be a mere thing for you...there are plenty of women who will lie down for you to walk over them-go to them then. (WL 250)

Enraged by her accusations, Birkin denounces the validity of statement and informs her that all he wants is for her to let herself go. By dictating that Ursula let herself go, Lawrence tries to free her from the overpowering superstructure that has overtaken her thought process. Ursula believes that "love was everything. Man must render himself up to her: he must be quaffed to the dregs by her. Let him be her man utterly, and she in return would be his humble slave" (WL 265). Lawrence and Birkin seek to free Ursula from her socialized mind and replace the social dominating ideology with an ideal that validates "...the individual was more than love, or than any relationship. For him, the bright, single soul accepted love as one of its conditions, a condition of its own equilibrium" (265).

Being unable to relinquish her established ideals and fully adopt Birkin's construction, Ursula is not immediately able to accept his proposal. While she is pondering Birkin's radical request, she encounters Hermoine at his home. Birkin has gone out and the two women are left alone for the afternoon. Being quite surprised by her presence, since Hermoine and Birkin used to be romantically involved, Ursula suffers through a disturbing conversation with Hermoine about whether or not she will accept Birkin's proposal. Within this scene, Lawrence displays the atrocities of the established society as depicted in Hermoine. As Ursula attempts to civilly discuss the discrepancies in Birkin's vision, Hermoine mockingly responds to her enquiries. She proposes that Birkin marry an "odalisk." Becoming enraged by her comment, Ursula begins to analyze her motives for being so crude.

He did not want an odalisk, he did not want a slave. Hermoine would have been his slave-there was in her a horrible desire to prostrate herself before a man...Hermoine was like a man, she believed only in men's things. She betrayed the woman in herself. (WL 295)

Ursula recognizes Hermione as a fallacy of womanhood. In giving Birkin an idealized version of love rather than the woman's love that Ursula offers, Hermoine has allowed herself to be a part of Gerald's mechanized society. Rather than acting upon her emotions, Hermoine has allowed herself to become a product of the social construction.

Enraged at Birkin's prior connection with Hermione, Ursula begins to question the validity of his argument and subsequently attempts to dissect his vision of marriage. She accuses Birkin of still being in love or lust with Hermoine. He professes that "I was wrong to go on all those years with Hermione-it was a deathly process" (WL 306).

Hermoine's belief system never correlated with Birkin's ideal vision because "she wants petty, immediate power, she wants the illusion that she is a great woman, that is all. -In her soul she's devilish unbeliever, common as dirt"(WL 307). Since Hermoine is ultimately a creation of the social ideology and Birkin a free spirit, the two would never have achieved a successful relationship. Their union would have resulted much like Gudrun and Gerald's as indicated by Hermoine's attempt to murder Birkin. He attempts to persuade Ursula of his rejection of Hermoine and all that she symbolizes with little results. As the fighting reaches a climax, Ursula pulls the rings from her fingers, tosses them at Birkin, and walks away in a fit of anger. In this moment, both characters release their belief system and their adherence to the superstructure. Shortly after her departure, she returns with a freshly revived pleasant attitude. From this day forward, their union has been established. Ursula relinquishes her former ideals and embraces an individualistic marriage.

Although Ursula and Birkin appear to have surpassed the restrictions placed on the other characters by the superstructure, the fate of their marriage is revealed upon Gerald's death. Despite Birkin's ability to form Ursula into an individualist, Birkin reveals that "to make it complete, really happy, I wanted eternal union with a man too: another kind of love" (WL 481). His dissatisfaction at the close of the novel can be explained through Marxist ideals. Since Ursula conformed from her natural existence to an individual state to satisfy Birkin, she shall never function completely through individualistic ideals. She did not search for a lifestyle beyond the established society, it was insisted upon her. Also, the homoerotic references throughout the book and in Birkin's farewell to Gerald assert that masculine love is an essential component to

Birkin's life. Woman to an extent are alienated from men by their gender alone. However, there must be an equal balance between masculine and heterosexual love to achieve complete fulfillment. Since the balance has been disrupted, the fate of Ursula and Birkin's marriage is unknown. Being the product of Lawrence's concept of individualism, Birkin shall continue prosper.

Through the novel's exploration of political, social, economic and marital components of the superstructure, Lawrence has doomed his characters to a meaningless existence. The only character to escape the pitfalls of the novel is Birkin. He is the epitome of an individualistic soul. Lawrence seems to be reflecting his own ideals through Birkin to counteract the mechanized society. Although Marxist critique supports the breaking down of the superstructure, Lawrence detaches from this political theory and allows the individual to transcend the social constraints. The answer for Lawrence is not a political revolution and shift of power, but rather a personal triumph. Throughout *Women in Love*, Lawrence can be perceived as attacking the power structure through a Marxist critique, but no one can label Lawrence as a Marxist. Capitalism is subverted for Lawrence by the power of individualism.

Lawrence's political analysis and critiques of the constant struggle between the bourgeois and proletarian classes coincides with Marxist theory. Although Lawrence's solution to the social issues did not resemble the revolutionary beliefs of Marx due to his emphasis on individuality and heightened level of spiritualism, his exposure of the social machine, hatred for the bourgeoisie and Victorian capitalism with its dehumanization of the worker embodies the essence of Marxism; "as in *Women in Love*, Lawrence takes a cosmic and strongly apocalyptic view of the world around him...the impending collapse

of modern machine culture" (Fjagesund 43). Throughout both novels, Lawrence resists the dominant ideology of his era and questions the power structure that dominates society. Through placing his characters within the superstructure and exposing the various ideological constraints, Lawrence allows them to either be freed from the mechanical society or ignore the hypocrisy of the system and stay as a functioning part in the social machine.

Works Cited

- Balbert, Peter. "Logic of the Soul." D.H. Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.
- Balbert, Peter. D.H. Lawrence and The Psychology of Rhythm. Paris: Mouton, 1974.
- Ben-Ephraim, Gavriel. The Moon's Dominion. Teaneck: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1981.
- Bentley, Michael. "Lawrence's Political Thought." D.H. Lawrence: New Studies. Ed. Christopher Heywood. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.
- Booker, M. Keith. "Marxist Literary Criticism." A Practical Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism. New York: Longman Publishers, 1996.
- Eagleton, Terry. Marxism and Literary Criticism. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976.
- Fjagesund, Peter. The Apocalyptic World of D.H. Lawrence. London: Norwegian University Press, 1991.
- Hoggart, Richard. Between Two Worlds: Politics, Anti-Politics, and the Unpolitical. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2002.
- Mackillop, Ian. "*Women in Love*, Class War and Scholl Inspectors." D.H. Lawrence: New Studies. Ed. Christopher Heywood. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.
- Oates, Joyce Carol. "Apocalyptic Vision." Modern Critical Views: D. H. Lawrence. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986.
- Preston, Peter and Peter Hoare. Ed. D.H. Lawrence in the Modern World. "The Restoration of *Women in Love*." Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Poplawski, Paul. Ed. Writing the Body in D.H. Lawrence. Paul Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- Sagar, Keith. D.H. Lawrence: Life Into Art. Georgia: University of Georgia Press Athens, 1985.
- The Rainbow. D.H. Lawrence. New York: Penguin Books, 1989.
- Weekes, Kinkad. D.H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile 1912-1922. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Women in Love. D.H. Lawrence. New York: Penguin Books, 1987.

Worthen, John. D.H. Lawrence and The Idea of the Novel. New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979.